

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Tommy Dwayne Brown, )  
                        )  
Plaintiff,            )  
                        ) Civil Action No. 8:24-cv-4730-BHH  
v.                     )  
                        )  
Anderson County SWAT Team, )  
                        )  
Defendant.            )  
                        )

---

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Tommy Dwayne Brown's ("Plaintiff") pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of his constitutional rights. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On November 12, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued an order informing Plaintiff that his complaint was subject to dismissal as drafted and providing him time to file an amended complaint to correct the identified deficiencies. (ECF No. 14.) When Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report") on December 11, 2024, outlining the issues and recommending that the Court dismiss this action with prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to comply with a court order. (ECF No. 17.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections to the Report have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. **Accordingly, the Court hereby adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 17), and the Court dismisses this action with prejudice, without further leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

January 9, 2024  
Charleston, South Carolina